UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/570,909	03/29/2006	Carsten Hopf	50125/147001 1220	
21559 CLARK & ELI	7590 11/20/200 BING LLP	9	EXAMINER	
101 FEDERAL	STREET		HILL, KEVIN KAI	
BOSTON, MA 02110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/20/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentadministrator@clarkelbing.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/570,909	HOPF, CARSTEN		
=	Examiner	Art Unit		
	KEVIN K. HILL	1633		
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Nor</u>	us of Application: <u>Non-Final Rejection</u>		
(1) <u>KEVIN K. HILL, USPTO</u> .	(3)			
(2) Kristina Bieker-Brady, Applicant's representative.	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>12 November 2009</u>	Time:			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)			
Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: Claims 7, 9-10 and 69-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first requirement.	st paragraph, as failing to comply	with the written description		
Claims discussed: Claims 7, 71, 72, 76				
Prior art documents discussed:				
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:		
Part III.				
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview		
/Kevin K. Hill/ Examiner, Art Unit 1633 (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The breadth of "modulating" embraces compounds that activate gamma secretase activity to reduce Abeta-42 formation; however, the specification only supports decreased FADS2 activity that consequently inhibits γ -secretase activity and thereby achieving a reduction in the production of Abeta-42. While Czirr et al (2008) teach the use of compounds affecting γ -secretase activity to reduce the production of Abeta-42 peptides, Czirr et al do not teach the compounds to stimulate or increase γ -secretase activity to achieve the reduced production of Abeta-42. To advance prosecution, the Examiner proposed cancellation of the claims drawn to "modulating".

The Examiner proposed adding the phrase "enzymatically active" before "fatty acid delta-6 desaturase" to clarify that the FADS2 has biological activity, and thus the claims, e.g. Claim 76, do not read upon enzymatically inactive fragments.

In a telephone conversation with Applicant's representative on November 17, 2009, Applicant's representative requested the Examiner refrain from acting on the next Office Action until December 1, 2009 so as to allow Applicant, who is/are foreign inventors, time to respond to the proposed amendments. The Examiner has agreed to do so, and expects a response from Applicant by December 1, 2009. Applicant's representative also requested whether the phrase "functionally active" may be used instead of "enzymatically active", as per [0015, 0018 and 0020] of the published application. Upon review of the definitions provided in the specification, e.g. functionally active includes enzymatically active [0018], the Examiner agrees that the phrase "functionally active" is a sufficient replacement of "enzymatically active".